

Integrated Logistics Capabilities (ILC) Program



Centralized Secondary Reparables Management Project Plan (Draft)

November 2000

Document Control Number: ILC SECREP PMP 2.0

Prepared by:

The Integrated Logistics Capability Center (LPI)

Deputy Commandant for Installations and Logistics Headquarters Marine Corps

Headquarters Marine Corps

Washington DC, 20380-1775

Program Management Approval

Submitted: _____

Secondary Repairable Project Officer

Reviewed: _____

Integrated Logistics Capability, Director

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| SECTION 1 – INTRODUCTION/OVERVIEW | 1 |
| SECTION 2 – MISSION AND OBJECTIVES | 1 |
| SECTION 3 – APPLICABLE DOCUMENTS | 1 |
| SECTION 4 – WORK SCOPE | 2 |
| 4.1 KEY APPROACHES/STRATEGIES, ASSUMPTIONS, REQUIREMENTS AND PROGRAM DELIVERABLES/END PRODUCTS..... | 2 |
| 4.1.1 Key Approaches/Strategies..... | 2 |
| 4.1.2 Assumptions..... | 2 |
| 4.1.3 Requirements..... | 3 |
| 4.1.4 Project Deliverables..... | 3 |
| 4.1.5 Constraints..... | 3 |
| 4.1.6 Excluded Scope..... | 3 |
| 4.2 PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS AND THEIR ROLES..... | 3 |
| 4.3 LOGISTICS ACTIVITIES..... | 4 |
| 4.4 KEY DATES..... | 4 |
| 4.5 RISK/PLAN ASSESSMENT | 4 |
| 4.5.1 Technical Risk..... | 4 |
| 4.5.2 Cost Risk..... | 5 |
| 4.5.3 Schedule Risk | 5 |
| SECTION 5 – WORK BREAKDOWN STRUCTURE (WBS)..... | 5 |
| SECTION 6 – PROJECT DOCUMENTATION | 5 |
| APPENDIX A WORK BREAKDOWN STRUCTURE..... | 1 |
| APPENDIX B REQUIREMENTS DETERMINATION PROCESS | ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED. |

Section 1 – Introduction/Overview

The Secondary Reparable (SECREP) Management (SRM) Project Plan presents the implementation strategy for the transfer of management responsibility of SECREP materiel to Commander, Marine Corps Materiel Command (COMMARCOMMATCOM). This document identifies the objectives and actions required to implement this concept. Further, it includes a Work Breakdown Structure (WBS), which is contained in Appendix A.

The consolidation of SRM at the Materiel Command (MATCOM) is the first in a series of business process reengineering projects to improve logistics support to the Fleet Marine Force (FMF). The transfer of the SRM to MATCOM is one of the products of the Integrated Logistics Capability (ILC) Business Case Study (case study). Recommendations from the case study and implementing directives from the Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps (ACMC), direct the centralization of the SRM as the first ILC product.

The centralization of SRM project initially focuses on centralizing the inventory management and gaining in-transit visibility by Initial Operating Capability (IOC). Full Operational Capability (FOC) includes the documentation to reengineer processes, identification of enabling solutions, and plans to insert technology into the process. The project will be completed once this ILC initiative has been developed into a Universal Needs Statement (UNS) and gone through the Concept Requirements Determination Process (CBRP). Basic information concerning the CBRP is contained in Appendix C. However, the overall CBRP process and UNS format is currently under review and once the new CBRP is approved it will be incorporated into this document.

Section 2 – Mission and Objectives

The mission of the Integrated Logistics Capability Center (ILCC) is to act in an oversight role during the development of this and other logistics business process reengineering initiatives. Additionally, the ILCC has the responsibility to identify potential best business practices, internal and external to the Marine Corps, for analysis, testing, and implementation, across the Marine Corps enterprise.

The objectives of the ILCC for the management of this project are:

1. Provide oversight of project from planning through FOC.
2. Identify and assist single process owner responsible for IOC.
3. Identify and consolidate all data necessary to process this concept through the Marine Corps Combat Development System (CDS).
4. Provide project support as required by the single process owner.

Section 3 – Applicable Documents

- (a) MARCOMMATCOM Integrated Logistics Capability, Case Study & Appendices, 03/04/99
- (b) Integrated Logistic Capability Business Plan
- (c) Marine Corps Order 4400.79F dated 2 Feb 90 (Provisioning Manual)
- (d) Users Manual 4400-123, section 14 (Baseline for Secondary Reparable Management)
- (e) Marine Corps Order P4400.82F (Controlled Items Manual)
- (f) MCO P4400.16G (Uniform Material Movement and Issue Priority System (UMMIPS))

- (g) Marine Corps Order P4790.2 MIMMS Field Procedures Manual
- (h) Technical Manual 4700-15 (1018 Tag Policy)
- (i) Department Of Defense (DOD) 4140.1-R (Super Regulations, Requirements Determination, Provisioning, and Stock Management).
- (j) FSMAO letter 4400 dated 18 May 00 (Initial Issue Provisioning (IIP) Special Analysis)
- (k) CMC Message 010101Z May 00

Section 4 – Work Scope

4.1 KEY APPROACHES/STRATEGIES, ASSUMPTIONS, REQUIREMENTS AND PROGRAM DELIVERABLES/END PRODUCTS

4.1.1 Key Approaches/Strategies

The ILCC approach to project management is one of centralized planning with decentralized execution. This Project Management Plan (PMP) documents the initial planning process prior to IOC, identifies documentation necessary during the operational assessment, documents FOC, and provides initial guidance to submit this concept into the CBRP. From the ILC perspective there are three phases of this project plan. The first phase is concept development, followed by operational assessment/concept refinement, and finally project completion and CBRP documentation.

During concept development, the ILCC in conjunction with the MATCOM is responsible to develop the Implementation Plan (IP), Plan of Action and Milestones (POA&M), and develop Courses of Action (COA) for approval by the ILC Executive Steering Committee (ESC) at IOC. In order to accomplish these deliverables, the ILCC and MATCOM will assemble a Working Integrated Process Team (WIPT) made up of Subject Matter Experts (SME's) from across the Marine Corps. The COA, IP and associated POA&M identify the roles and responsibilities and define the requirements for IOC as well as those actions necessary for the eventual complete transfer of management of SECREPs at FOC to MATCOM.

In the second phase, MATCOM identifies and begins those actions necessary to develop an initial centralized SRM at IOC, and ends with complete ownership of SRM at FOC. During the second phase, the ILCC functions solely as a supporting organization monitoring, documenting, and gathering data. During this phase the ILCC coordinates with MATCOM to assemble the necessary UNS documentation for submission of the concept via the UNS into the CBRP. With the submission of the UNS into the CBRP the third phase begins and will end with FOC.

4.1.2 Assumptions

Assumptions for this project follow below:

- (1) The documentation from the case study provides adequate operational and business logic to develop the centralization of SRM concept.
- (2) The definition of IOC, for the purposes of this project, is the initiation of the planning and actions necessary for SRM across the Marine Corps business enterprise.
- (3) The definition of FOC is worldwide ownership of the secondary reparable process to include management and materiel.
- (4) Maintenance for this project is a source of supply; the maintenance process itself is out of scope.

- (5) The worldwide SRM is not dependent on the development of new IT
- (6) Analysis of SRM includes Low Density (LD), Depot Level Repairable (DLR), and Field Level Repairable (FLR).
- (7) COMMARCOMMATCOM has authority to direct redistribution; however, Marine Expeditionary Units (MEU) have priority.

4.1.3 Requirements

To validate the worldwide SRM concept, MATCOM must adequately address the following processes.

- (1) Maintain or improve readiness within the Operating Forces.
- (2) Gain total SECREP asset visibility.
- (3) Assess and identify the risks associated with increasing the use of distribution channels to replace inventory.
- (4) Develop a plan for real-time distributed information management.
- (5) Identify the requirements necessary to centralize financial management for SRM.
- (6) That the “to-be” SRM procedures are integrated into the enterprise supply chain.
- (7) Identify performance metrics that have application to the enterprise supply chain.
- (8) Identify enabling solutions necessary to realize Information Technology (IT).

4.1.4 Project Deliverables

The project deliverable is the Universal Needs Statement (UNS). The UNS begins the approval process of the concept in the CDS. Appendix B identifies documentation and data necessary to prepare a UNS.

4.1.5 Constraints

- (1) MATCOM assumes IOC on 1 Oct 00 and FOC on 1 Oct 01.
- (2) MATCOM will initially gain worldwide SRM responsibility using existing IT software.
- (3) MATCOM will not receive additional resources, people or money, at IOC to manage SRM worldwide.

4.1.6 Excluded Scope

The remanufacture of secondary repairable materiel is out of scope for the purposes of this project.

4.2 PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS AND THEIR ROLES

- (1) Materiel Readiness Team, ILCC is the PM for the centralization of SRM.
- (2) MATCOM is responsible to develop POA&M and Issues for assumption of SRM management.
- (3) WIPT. (Guidelines for membership of WIPTs is covered in the business plan)
 - (a) Program Manger: Major Scott J. Koster

- (b) Project Manager: LtCol Michael R. Rudolph
 - (c) Assistant Project Manager: Major Marc Webster
 - (d) Logistics Engineer: Mr. Roy E. Truba, Jr.
 - (e) Reparable Issue Point representatives (3002/3010/3043(7-I, II, III, and IV MEF, HI, MCCAGCC, 29 Palms, and BIC))
 - (f) Maintenance Subject Matter Experts (SME)
 - (g) MATCOM Staff
 - (h) HQMC Supply Policy: CW05 Ron Cookson
 - (i) Legacy Software SME: Mr. Michael Cochran
 - (j) COMMARCORSYSCOM PMIS
- (4) The ILCC will retain overall responsibility for the management of SRM program. LtCol Rudolph as the project manger, will monitor, direct, and provide program guidance for execution of the program.

4.3 LOGISTICS ACTIVITIES

Appendix A identifies a POA&M (WBS) of the major activities and owner. Appendix B contains a proposed budget plan to support this project.

4.4 KEY DATES

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Initial Concept Brief/POA&M/Issues | 31 May 00 |
| Concept Brief/Final POA&M to CSSE Advocacy Bd. | 20/21 Jul 00 |
| Initial Operating Capability | 1 Oct 00 |
| Final Operating Capability | 1 Oct 01 |
| Input Concept into CBRP | 2 nd Qtr FY01 |

4.5 RISK/PLAN ASSESSMENT

Centralizing SRM at MATCOM without initially applying emerging enabling technology or leveraging cutting edge better business practices (i.e. Quadrant Model, SCOR Modeling, etc.) presents a potential for technical, cost, and schedule risk. The risks for centralizing SRM are moderate given that this is the first project from the case study.

4.5.2 Technical Risk

Technical risk is low that centralization of SRM will not meet the requirements at FOC. The centralization of SRM impacts a small number of Commands in the Fleet Marine Force and the Supporting Establishment; and SRM in general is transparent to the Using Units less the LD units.

The potential for risk exists as the centralization of SRM begins to capitalize materiel and resources and at FOC prior to the development of enterprise enabling solutions, i.e. implementing the Quadrant Model, an order management system, etc. There is risk inherent to the transfer of materiel, labor, and money. At IOC there is no physical transfer of materiel or resources to

centrally manage SRM. Prior to FOC MATCOM shall provide an assessment to the ILC ESC recommending a resource plan. The plan shall include a proposed materiel capitalization plan, table of organization and locations, and budget.

There is a second technical challenge that has a tie to the enterprise enabling solution. Beyond FOC the technical risk is high that this project can meet or exceed the expectations of the case study until full application of the better business practices. Initially, as MATCOM begins to gain ownership of the management and eventual materiel and resources without the application of better business practices e.g. quadrant model, technical risk is high. Further, the PM must integrate existing legacy software to provide a semblance of enterprise resource planning tools. Until the enterprise decides on the suite of IT tools, MATCOM will not be able to realize the savings identified in the case study.

Finally, there is medium risk associated with MATCOM developing and refining existing processes and activities to centrally manage SRM. There is a potential to create a SRM stovepipe process much like the SRM under the SASSY Maintenance Float Balance File.

4.5.3 Cost Risk

Cost risk is medium and initially MATCOM bears funding responsibility from existing funding lines in FY00 and FY01. Since SRM is the first project, MATCOM at first, will not have the opportunity to leverage the work from the architecture or the quadrant model development. These two factors create significant unknowns relative to the cost of this project to meet the expectations of the case study, creating medium cost risk. Once the architecture and quadrant model work are available for enterprise use, the PM will have a better understanding of the cost to achieve the case study forecasts.

4.5.4 Schedule Risk

The schedule risk is low because MATCOM can currently meet the requirements of IOC with very little changes to existing processes, software, or resources. However, the risk to meet the requirements of FOC is substantially greater. MATCOM faces complete ownership and some tough decisions relative to the utilization of resources and leveraging the work from the architecture development. FOC is attainable by 1 October 01 but, realizing the forecasts of the case study may not be as achievable at that time.

Section 5 – Work Breakdown Structure (WBS)

Appendix A depicts the initial schedule of events surrounding this ILC project. The actual WBS and future project events will be developed by MATCOM and become part of their implementation plan.

Section 6 – Project Documentation

MATCOM will act as the single point of collection for all documentation relative to the project. Documentation is instrumental to the success or failure of this project. Further, the documentation also acts as the baseline from which to base future process adjustments.

Appendix A Work Breakdown Structure

Initial Project Schedule Of Events

| Project Events | Description/Location | Dates |
|----------------|--|-------------------|
| | Develop Plans, MCCDC (ILC) | 1 Jan-15May 00 |
| | Data Gather, MCCDC/MATCOM/MEF's | 1 Jan-30 Sept 00 |
| WIPT | Initial WIPT Workshop (MCCDC) | 30 Mar 00 |
| OA | ELMACO Analysis HQMC (LX) | 15Mar-30 Jun 00 |
| OA | Supply Chain Processes Interface Analysis MCCDC/MATCOM | 1 Apr-30 Jun 00 |
| OA | SECREP IIP Analysis DC I&L (LPP/FSMAO) | 1 Apr-30 Jun 00 |
| | LOI Concept brief (MATCOM) | 31 May 00 |
| | Publish MATCOM LOI for project | June 00 |
| WIPT | First WIPT Workshop (MATCOM) | 10-19 July 00 |
| | Centralized SECREP Mgmt Concept Brief to CSSE Advocacy Board | 20/21 Jul 00 |
| WIPT | Second WIPT Workshop (MATCOM) | 14-23 August 00 |
| | IOC Assessment preparation (MATCOM) | August-October 00 |
| | Initial Operational Assessment (OA) | 26-28 Sept 00 |
| WIPT | Third WIPT Workshop (MATCOM) (SMEs Review OA results) | 23-27 Oct 00 |
| | IOC Report and brief to ILC ESG | 31 Oct 00 |
| | Develop FOC | Oct 00-Oct 01 |
| | UNS Submission into CBRP (tentative) | March 01 |
| | FOC for a Centralized SECREP management capability | 1 Oct 01 |
| | | |

Appendix B Requirements Determination Process (under review)

Requirements Process Overview

After the draft UNS is published, the Capability Assessment Council (CAC) (as the senior advisory forum within the CBRP) is composed of representatives of the CDS process owners, functional leaders, and the Operating forces. The purpose of the Capability Assessment Working Group/CAC reviews is to assess Marine Corps current capabilities and future requirements, seek out opportunities to improve doctrine, force structure, equipment, and other organizational capabilities and analyze them for suitability and probability of attainment. Therefore, the purpose of the teams' plans is to ensure that the ILC project(s) end properly by capturing all simulation/testing results, in order for the CAC to consider all policy, simulation/testing, and Doctrine, Organization, Training and Education, Equipment, Support and facilities (DOTES) areas before arriving at a course of action and recommendation to meet the capability required.

Decision Brief

This activity begins by formally presenting the ILC recommendation with staffing comments and recommendations to the CAWG. A verbal presentation with briefing slides; highlighting the important information contained in the CAC Decision Brief is presented initially before the CAWG.

- (1) Using DOTES as a framework, the CAWG collectively analyzes and discusses the issues to be considered, any staffing comments, and each DOTES alternative and implication in order to determine which is best for the Marine Corps. The CAWG assesses whether or not the information presented is factual, sufficient in detail, and appropriately staffed. If not, the matter is required to be re-briefed to the CAWG at a later date;
- (2) The stated issue represents a valid requirement;
- (3) An existing program satisfies the stated need;
- (4) Whether or not modifications are required to the CAC Decision Brief; and,
- (5) The level of detail the issue needs to be presented before the CAC (full or partial briefing). Each submission considered by the CAWG is presented to the CAC.

However, the level of detail provided will depend on the complexity of an issue, results of the research conducted, and the conclusions and recommendations of the CAWG. At a minimum, a synopsis of the stated need and results of the CAWG vote will be provided to the CAC members for validated issues. For issues not validated by the CAWG, a written Decision Brief and CAWG recommendations will be prepared by the DOTES Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) and provided to the CAC. A full briefing of the issue will be presented to the CAC when requested or warranted.

CAWG

Approved Decision Briefs (the proposed UNS) and the original statement of need will be forwarded to the CAC in the read-ahead package as old business. The read-ahead package also contains a status report of any previously validated logistics initiatives that may relate. CAWG-approved issues may be electronically presented to the CAC for review. For contentious issues, the CAWG-assigned OPR formally presents the issue, staffing comments and CAWG recommended alternatives to the CAC. The presentation briefing highlights the important information contained in the CAC Decision Paper. At a minimum, the issue will be electronically presented to the CAC for concurrence. Concurrence normally precludes formal presentation to the CAC. Selected informational briefings may be presented to the CAC without prior referral to the CAWG. Warfighting Development Integration Division (WDID) has the lead for this activity, with support from the DOTES OPR, the CAC, the CAWG Chair, and others as required.

Select Course Of Action

This is the decision point where the CAC selects a CAWG-recommended solution, develops its own solution, or requests that other alternatives be developed. Electronic concurrence normally precludes formal presentation to the CAC. Referral of the issue for formal study is also an option. The CAC Chair has the lead for this activity, with support from the CAC, the CAWG Chair, the DOTES OPR, and others as required.

Identify DOTES Actions

Expanding on the information captured in the UNS format, the CAC identifies specific DOTES implementing actions that are required to support the recommended course of action. These actions can be of a rough order of magnitude with anticipated modifications to the project plan as it progresses. If presented before the CAC, specific DOTES implementing actions are then assigned to responsible agencies and organizations. The CAC Chair has the lead for this activity, with support from the CAC, the DOTES OPR, the CAWG Chair, WDID, and others as required.

Prioritize Draft UNS

The CAC considers the CAWG's recommended priority ranking of the proposed INS within the overall CBRP prioritized list of UNS's. This helps clarify main and supporting operational combat development efforts, and guide internal personnel, time, fiscal and other combat development resource commitments. The CAC chair has the lead for this activity, with support from the CAC, the CAWG Chair, the DOTES OPR, Capability Integrator, and others as required.

Determine Resourcing Urgency

Based on the CAWG recommendation, the CAC determines whether to recommend that CG MCCDC request normal acquisition, rapid acquisition, or use urgent needs to procure equipment solutions identified by an UNS. If the UNS requires using urgent resourcing and it is high on the list of approved UNS's, it is given serious consideration for immediate funding and a reallocation from other efforts may be considered and requested. Using "urgent needs" to justify circumventing acquisition constraints must be held to a minimum and addressed by the CAC. Otherwise, the UNS will compete in the next Program Objective Memorandum (POM) cycle. The CAC Chair has the lead for this activity, with support from the CAC, the CAWG Chair, the DOTES OPR, WDID Capability Integrators, and others as required.

Complete Draft INS

The CAC Chair ensures all recommendations and decisions are recorded and prioritized and then decides whether to approve the completed draft UNS, return the issue to the CAWG for additional work if the topic is complex and requires more technical analysis. If the CAC Chair recommends approval, the matter is forwarded to the CG MCCDC for decision. The minutes and decisions of the CAC meeting are recorded on the draft UNS. CG MCCDC acceptance of the CAC decision upon a course of action, or approval of the CAWG-submitted conclusions and recommendations constitutes approval of the UNS. The approved UNS serves as the starting point to pursue an acquisition program or other DOTES development actions. Validated requirements are then passed to the appropriate WDID Capability Integrator who manages implementing actions to ensure all related initiatives are developed into integrated capabilities.

Develop Equipment Requirement Documentation

MCCDC, (Requirements Division), develops the documentation required by DoD acquisition regulations to initiate acquisition programs. CG MCCDC is the user's representative; ACMC is the Approving Authority for Marine Corps equipment requirements.

(1) If the UNS produced by the CAC includes a need for equipment, it is forwarded to MCCDC (Requirements Division) who will generate a new Mission Need Statement (MNS), or incorporate the need into an existing MNS or Operational Requirement Document (ORD). The primary document in the Marine Corps materiel acquisition process is the ORD. It describes specific materiel capabilities required by the Marine Corps to meet the needs or capabilities identified in the MNS. The MNS is the document used to reach a Milestone 0 decision. The ORD is the document used to reach a Milestone I decision and to enter the concept demonstration/validation phase of materiel development (the MLCM Process if applicable). MCCDC Requirements Division concurrently staffs the initial draft documents (MNS, Concept of Employment, and ORD) to the divisions within MCCDC, MATCOM, MCOTEA, Operating Forces, Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) J6, HQMC staff agencies, and to the other Services for review and comment. The period allowed for staffing the draft documents is 45 days. Revisions to the draft documents are made as appropriate, considering all inputs. The Draft Document becomes a Proposed Document once staffing comments have been incorporated. CG, MCCDC will prepare and forward the proposed documents to the ACMC for approval. The proposed document will be accompanied by a comments disposition sheet, which shows the disposition of all comments.

(2) MCCDC Requirements Division reviews the requirements documents of other Services to determine their potential to satisfy validated Marine Corps equipment requirements. When such documents appear to satisfy a valid Marine Corps materiel requirement, they can be adopted as official Marine Corps materiel requirements documents. As with all other materiel requirements documents, they are forwarded to ACMC for approval. Additionally, other Service documents are forwarded to MCCDC Requirements Division for inter-service harmonization. MCCDC Requirements Division is responsible for preparing and submitting a Marine Corps position in the form of a Joint Potential Designator for proposed Joint Requirements. Following ACMC approval, CG, MCCDC will publish and distribute the documents. MMS's, once approved, are not changed or amended. Changes to ORD's are classified as either major or minor. Minor changes can be approved by CG, MCCDC. Major changes are changes to the Mission, Threat, or any Key Performance Parameter. Major changes must be staffed to the operating force commands and approved by ACMC.

(3) An approved Mission Needs Statement (MNS) or Operational Requirements Document (ORD) remains in the Requirements Catalog until it is retired. The retiring authority for any requirements document is the same as the approving authority. To retire a requirements document, it must be submitted to ACMC with a statement of the rationale for requesting retirement. The request for retirement of a requirement document will be staffed to the MARFOR commands prior to submitting it to the ACMC. Once retired, a requirement document cannot be removed from the retired category. In the event that a similar need is identified, a new UNS, MNS, and ORD must be initiated.

